

**REMARKS**

The Office Action of November 17, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

The present Amendment revises independent claims 1 and 7 by reciting "means for communicating by radio with the base station during a telephone call." It is respectfully submitted that this does not raise a new issue or require further searching, since the invention that is defined by claims 1 and 7 is "A cellular telephone." Moreover, claim 15 already recites "means for communicating with a base station during a telephone call by a person who uses the microphone during the telephone call," so communicating by radio with a base station during a telephone call cannot be considered to be a new issue.

Section 3 of the Office Action rejects independent claims 1, 7, and 13 (along with several dependent claims) for anticipation by Kim et al. This reference will hereafter be called simply "Kim." Although section 1 of the Office Action provides further comments in support of the rejections, the rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons noted below.

The cellular telephone defined by claim 1 now has means for communicating with a base station during a telephone call (as noted above), and also transmission means for transmitting to a TV receiver. That is, the cellular telephone has two transmission systems. One advantage of this is that the cellular phone of claim 1 permits karaoke entertainment wherever a television set is located without an external karaoke device being needed. Another advantage is that the same microphone that is used during a telephone call (although a microphone is not specifically recited in claim 1) can also be used for karaoke.

In contrast, Kim uses an external karaoke device 202. This is clear because the reference says that Kim's karaoke device 202 is "connected to" his mobile station 208a (see column 4, lines 17-22). Kim's mobile station 208a itself has means for communicating with the base station, but lacks the second transmission means that is recited in claim 1 ("transmission means for transmitting the TV broadcasting signals to a TV receiver").

Section 1 of the Office Action responds to arguments that were presented in the last Amendment by commenting that Kim teaches a mobile telephone terminal that downloads karaoke data, a portable karaoke device, and radio transmission and TV broadcasting. Regardless of what the reference as a whole might disclose, though, claim 1 is directed to a cellular telephone, and Kim's karaoke device 202 is not part of his mobile station 208a. Kim's karaoke device 202 also lacks a "transmission means for transmitting the TV broadcast signals to a TV receiver (Kim's device 202 has an external output terminal for connection to the TV receiver 214; see column 4, lines 50-56), but even if Kim's karaoke device 202 had the "transmission means" of claim 1, this transmission means would not be part of Kim's mobile station 208a.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Kim does not discloses the cellular telephone that is defined by claim 1. The rejection for anticipation should therefore be withdrawn. Moreover, Kim would not have led an ordinarily skilled person to appreciate the advantages that arise with a cellular telephone in accordance with claim 1, so an ordinarily skilled person would not have had a motivation to modify Kim in accordance with claim 1.

Like claim 1, independent claim 7 is now directed to a cellular telephone that comprises "means for communicating by radio with a base station during a telephone call." Claim 7 also recites that the cellular telephone also includes "a transmission circuit transmitting the TV broadcasting signals to a TV receiver." For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Kim neither discloses nor suggests such a cellular telephone.

Turning now to independent claim 15, this claim recites "means for communicating with a base station during a telephone call..." and also "means for transmitting the TV broadcasting signals to a TV receiver." It is therefore respectfully submitted that the invention defined by claim 15 is patentable over Kim for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. However, claim 15 also recites "a microphone" and provides that this microphone is used both during a telephone call and for audio signals sung into the microphone during a karaoke performance. This is not suggested by Kim. Kim's Figure 3 shows that his karaoke device 202 has its own microphone 307. It is apparent that Kim

neither discloses nor suggests that the same microphone is used for telephone calls and karaoke.

The remaining claims depend from the independent claims discussed above and recite additional limitations that further define the invention. They are therefore patentable along with their independent claim and need not be further discussed. Nevertheless, the Amselem and Haino references will now be briefly addressed.

Amselem merely shows communication between a karaoke system 12 and user devices that include a cellular telephone. The reference does not show the components of the cellular telephone. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Amselem does not suggest the features recited in claims 4-6 and 10-12.

The Haino reference merely discloses a musical information reproducing apparatus that displays characters based on size information provided from an input device.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen Wood  
Registration No. 28,134  
Customer number 23995  
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.  
(202) 326-0222 (telephone)  
(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)

AW/ng

AMENDMENT

10/648,782